arXiv:0710.4061v2 [quant-ph] 18 Jul 2010

How to quantify quantum entanglement degree

Yong Zhou
China University of Petroleum, College of Physics Science and Technology,
739 Bei'yi Road, Dongying Shandong 257061, China

Since the density matrix possesses the essential property of linear decomposition and linear superposition of quantum states, it only can be used to describe quantum states. So the entanglement contained in a density matrix is just the quantum entanglement. This means a bipartite state described by a density matrix contains quantum entanglement, unless the density matrix can be expressed by a direct product of the subsystem's density matrices $\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$. Thus the quantum entanglement degree between A and B systems can be determined by the expanding coefficients according to A or B system's orthonormal bases of the density matrix ρ_{AB}.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud

Quantum entanglement is a very important phenomenon since it is proposed by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen [1], Schrodinger [2] and Bell [3]. The nonlocality and the coherence of quantum entangled systems makes them have important applications in quantum information, such as in quantum teleportation [4] (for experimental realization see [5]), quantum cryptographic schemes [6], dense coding [7] and quantum parallel computation [8]. The quantifying of the quantum entanglement degree of bipartite pure states has been well done [9], but how to define and quantify other complex systems' quantum entanglement degree is still a very hard problem [10].

Since any bipartite quantum system has a corresponding (reduced) density matrix to describe it, we can study the bipartite quantum entanglement degree through its density matrix. It's well known that the density matrix is composed of the state vectors of linear Hilbert space, so the density matrix has the property of linear decomposition and linear superposition which is the unique property of quantum states, therefore a density matrix cannot be used to describe a classical state, it only can be used to describe quantum state. Speaking concretely, there isn't quantum correlation between classical states, so a superposition of several classical states cannot create new state through linear decomposition and recombination. On the contrary, if a system is described by the density matrix $\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$, the system's state isn't limited to the range $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$. The measuring result of the system can be any linear combination state $\psi^{'}$ of the states $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ which makes $tr(\rho|\psi^{'}\rangle\langle\psi^{'}|)$ nonzero. This is because the states $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}$ in the density matrix ρ can be freely linearly decomposed and recombined to create new states. This means the states in a density matrix are quantum entangled together. So the entanglement present in a density matrix is just the quantum entanglement. This means that only the density matrix which can be expressed by a direct product of the subsystem's density matrices $\rho_{AB} = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ doesn't contain quantum entanglement. Any other density matrix, including the following form [11]:

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i \, \rho_i^A \otimes \rho_i^B \,, \tag{1}$$

where p_i satisfy $\sum_i p_i = 1$ and ρ_i^A and ρ_i^B are the density matrices of the two subsystems, contains quantum entanglement.

Obviously this conclusion contradicts the point of the scientists who considered the entanglement in Eq.(1) is classical entanglement [10–12]. As we have carefully discussed above, the state in Eq.(1) is a quantum state in which the states $\{\rho_i^A \otimes \rho_i^B\}$ get entangled with each other through quantum superposition, thus has quantum entanglement. Besides this point there are two other evidences to prove our conclusion. Firstly consider the three systems: A, B and C, if A gets quantum entangled with BC system group through a pure state:

$$|\psi_{ABC}\rangle = \sum_i \sqrt{p_i} |A_i B_i C_i\rangle \,, \tag{2}$$

where $\{|A_i\rangle\}$, $\{|B_i\rangle\}$ and $\{|C_i\rangle\}$ are the orthonormal bases of the corresponding systems, the density matrices describing A and B entanglement and A and C entanglement are:

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_i p_i |A_i B_i\rangle\langle A_i B_i| \,, \qquad \rho_{AC} = \sum_i p_i |A_i C_i\rangle\langle A_i C_i| \,. \tag{3}$$

If the point of the references [10–12] is right, there isn't quantum entanglement between A and B systems and A and C systems. But this conclusion contradicts a logical fact: if A gets entangled with BC system group, A must get entangled with at least one of B and C systems, otherwise A will get not entangled with BC system group. It is a logical fact that speaks for itself. Obviously only accepting the point that Eq.(1) contains quantum entanglement can resolve this question.

Another evidence can be found in quantum teleportation. Suppose B system is far away from A system and A and C systems are in a same location, and A, B and C systems are in the following quantum states:

$$\rho_{AB} = \frac{1}{2}(|A_1 B_1\rangle\langle A_1 B_1| + |A_2 B_2\rangle\langle A_2 B_2|) \,, \qquad |\psi_C\rangle = c_1 |C_1\rangle + c_2 |C_2\rangle \,. \tag{4}$$

Perform an union measurement of A and C systems to obtain one of the following possible states:

$$|\psi_{AC1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A_1 C_1\rangle + |A_2 C_2\rangle) \,, \qquad |\psi_{AC2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A_1 C_1\rangle - |A_2 C_2\rangle) \,,$$

$$|\psi_{AC3}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A_1C_2\rangle + |A_2C_1\rangle)\,, \qquad |\psi_{AC4}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A_1C_2\rangle - |A_2C_1\rangle)\,, \tag{5}$$

accordingly B system will change its state to one of the following possible states:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{B1} &= |c_1|^2|B_1\rangle\langle B_1| + |c_2|^2|B_2\rangle\langle B_2|\,, \qquad \rho_{B2} = \rho_{B1}\,, \\ \rho_{B3} &= |c_2|^2|B_1\rangle\langle B_1| + |c_1|^2|B_2\rangle\langle B_2|\,, \qquad \rho_{B4} = \rho_{B3}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

From Eqs.(6) we find B system is still in quantum state, and B system state contains part of the information of C system state–the module squares of the expanding coefficients of C system state. On the other hand, if use the well accepted quantum entangled state

$$|\psi_{AB}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A_1B_1\rangle + |A_2B_2\rangle)\,, \tag{7}$$

to replace the AB state in Eqs.(4) to perform the above experiment, we will obtain one of the following possible B system states according to the possible measuring results of Eqs.(5):

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{B1} &= |c_1|^2|B_1\rangle\langle B_1| + c_1c_2^*|B_1\rangle\langle B_2| + c_2c_1^*|B_2\rangle\langle B_1| + |c_2|^2|B_2\rangle\langle B_2|\,, \\ \rho_{B2} &= |c_1|^2|B_1\rangle\langle B_1| - c_1c_2^*|B_1\rangle\langle B_2| - c_2c_1^*|B_2\rangle\langle B_1| + |c_2|^2|B_2\rangle\langle B_2|\,, \\ \rho_{B3} &= |c_2|^2|B_1\rangle\langle B_1| + c_2c_1^*|B_1\rangle\langle B_2| + c_1c_2^*|B_2\rangle\langle B_1| + |c_1|^2|B_2\rangle\langle B_2|\,, \\ \rho_{B4} &= |c_2|^2|B_1\rangle\langle B_1| - c_2c_1^*|B_1\rangle\langle B_2| - c_1c_2^*|B_2\rangle\langle B_1| + |c_1|^2|B_2\rangle\langle B_2|\,. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Compare this result with Eqs.(6) we find the B system states in Eqs.(8) contain more information of C system state–the relative phase of the expanding coefficients c_1 and c_2. Therefore the quantum information channel $|\psi_{AB}\rangle\langle\psi_{AB}|$ in Eq.(7) is larger than the quantum information channel ρ_{AB} in Eqs.(4). However we cannot conclude the information channel ρ_{AB} in Eqs.(4) doesn't have the ability to transport quantum information. Since ρ_{AB} can transport quantum information, it must contain a certain kind of quantum entanglement between A and B systems.

From the above discussion it is obvious the quantum entanglement degree in Eq.(7) is larger than that in Eqs.(4). Compare the two equations it is believed that the increase of the quantum entanglement degree of Eq.(7) comes from the two more terms $\frac{1}{2}|A_1\rangle\langle A_2|B_1\rangle\langle B_2| + \frac{1}{2}|A_2\rangle\langle A_1|B_2\rangle\langle B_1|$ in the density matrix of Eq.(7) and the states of A and B systems in the two more terms are different from those in the other terms. In general it can be concluded that the quantum entanglement degree of A and B systems can be determined by the expanding coefficients according to A or B system's orthonormal bases of the density matrix ρ_{AB}. If A system's orthonormal bases are $\{|A_i\rangle, i = 1...n\}$, and B system's orthonormal bases are $\{|B_i\rangle, i = 1...m\}$, expand the density matrix ρ_{AB} according to A system's orthonormal bases:

$$\rho_{AB} = \sum_{i,i'=1}^{n} \rho_{ii'} |A_i\rangle\langle A_{i'}| \,, \tag{9}$$

where the expanding coefficients $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ can be written as follows:

$$\rho_{ii'} = \sum_{j,j'=1}^{m} p_{ii',jj'} |B_j\rangle\langle B_{j'}| \,. \tag{10}$$

If all of $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ are same, A and B systems will not get quantum entangled with each other, so the more different the different $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ are, the more large the quantum entanglement degree between A and B systems is. The difference between different $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ can be determined by the following quantity

$$X_{i_1 i'_1, i_2 i'_2} = tr(\rho_{i_1 i'_1} \rho^{\dagger}_{i_2 i'_2}) = \sum_{j,j'}^{m} p_{i_1 i'_1, jj'} p^{*}_{i_2 i'_2, jj'} \,. \tag{11}$$

The matrix X is a Hermitian matrix, so it can be diagonalized by an unitary matrix. This is equivalent to linear recombining the B system's states $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ to a set of orthonormal bases. The rank of matrix X, i.e. the number of nonzero diagonal elements of the diagonalized matrix X, is just the number of the orthonormal bases of the B system's states $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$. Obviously the more large the rank of matrix X is, the more large the quantum entanglement degree between A and B systems is. But it is difficult to use matrix X to quantify quantum entanglement degree, since the values of the matrix elements of X reflect not only the probability of the different states $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ in the density matrix ρ_{AB} and the difference between the different states $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$, but also the difference between pure states and mixed states (the trace of the square of pure state density matrix is 1, but the trace of the square of mixed state density matrix is less than 1), and the latter is nothing to do with the quantum entanglement degree of A and B systems. Up to the present we still haven't found a suitable method to quantify the quantum entanglement degree of a general quantum state.

In general, we discuss how to determine the quantum entanglement degree of a general quantum state described by a density matrix. We clarify the important facts that density matrices can only be used to describe quantum states and the entanglement contained in density matrices is just quantum entanglement. Under this point most of the quantum separable states people regarded as before, such as the bipartite state in Eq.(1), are in fact quantum entangled states, unless the density matrix of it can be expressed by a direct product of the subsystem's density matrices.

So the quantum entanglement degree of A and B systems can be determined through the expanding coefficients according to A or B system's orthonormal bases of the density matrix ρ_{AB} (see Eqs.(9, 10)). Obviously the different expanding coefficients $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ are more different, the quantum entanglement degree is more large. The difference between different expanding coefficients can be quantified by the Hermitian matrix X in Eq.(11). Unfortunately, it is difficult to use matrix X to quantify quantum entanglement degree, since the values of the matrix elements of X reflect not only the probability of the different states $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$ in the density matrix ρ_{AB} and the difference between the different states $\{\rho_{ii'}\}$, but also the difference between pure states and mixed states, and the latter is nothing to do with the quantum entanglement degree of A and B systems. Therefore a method of quantifying the quantum entanglement degree of a general quantum state is absent up to the present. However we should realize that the physics is a practical science and a mathematic definition without practical application isn't the thing we need, so it is always not too late for us to quantify quantum entanglement degree until we find the practical application of it.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks Prof. Hong-bo Zhu and Doctor Pei-lin Lang for the useful discussions with them.

---

[1] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. 47 (1935) 777.

[2] E. Schrodinger, Naturwissenschaften 23 (1935) 807.

[3] J.S. Bell, Physics (N.Y.) 1 (1964) 195.

[4] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 1895;
S. Albeverio and S.M. Fei, Phys. Lett. A 276 (2000) 8;
G.M. DAriano, P.Lo Presti, M.F. Sacchi, Phys. Lett. A 272 (2000) 32;
S. Albeverio and S.M. Fei and W.L. Yang, Phys. Rev. A 66 (2002) 012301.

[5] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Elbl, H. Weinfurter and A. Zeilinger, Nature (London) 390 (1997) 575;
M. A. Nielsen, E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Nature 396 (1998) 52;
Jian-Wei Pan, Matthew Daniell, Sara Gasparoni, Gregor Weihs, Anton Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86 (2001) 4435;
Thomas Jennewein, Gregor Weihs, Jian-Wei Pan, Anton Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88 (2001) 017903;
Qiang Zhang, Alexander Goebel, Claudia Wagenknecht, Yu-Ao Chen, Bo Zhao, Tao Yang, Alois Mair, Joerg Schmiedmayer, Jian-Wei Pan, Nature Physics 2 (2006) 678.

[6] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67 (1991) 661;
D. Deutsch, A. K. Ekert, R. Jozsa, C. Macchiavello, S. Popescu and A. Sanpera, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 2818;

C.A. Fuchs, N. Gisin, R.B. Griffiths, C-S. Niu, and A. Peres, Phys. Rev. A 56 (1997) 1163.

[7] C.H. Bennett and S.J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69 (1992) 2881.

[8] D.P. DiVincenzo, Science 270 (1995) 255;
M.A. Nielsen and I.L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[9] A. Peres, Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods, Kluwer Academic Publishers (1995).

[10] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 54 (1996) 3824;
V. Vedral, M.B. Plenio, M.A. Rippin, P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78 (1997) 2275;
C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, T. Mor, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin and B. M. Terhal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82 (1999) 5385;
W. Dur, J. I. Cirac and R. Tarrach, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83 (1999) 3562;
P. Horodecki, M. Lewenstein, G. Vidal and I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. A 62 (2000) 032310;
S. Karnas and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A 64 (2001) 042313;
K. Chen and L.A. Wu, Phys. Lett. A 306 (2002) 14;
S.M. Fei, J. Jost, X.Q. Li-Jost and G.F. Wang, Phys. Lett. A 310 (2003) 333;
O. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. A 67 (2003) 032312.

[11] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A 40 (1989) 4277.

[12] Asher Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 1413;
M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki and R. Horodecki, Springer Tracts in Mod. Phy. 173 (2001) 151;
B.M. Terhal, Theor. Comput. Sci. 287 (2002) 313;
K. Chen, S. Albeverio and S.M. Fei, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95 (2005) 210501.